



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,226	09/26/2003	Clifton A. Alferness	11998.1US12	2875

25764 7590 11/16/2006

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP
PATENT DOCKETING
2200 WELLS FARGO CENTER
90 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3901

EXAMINER

GETZOW, SCOTT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3762

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/672,226

Applicant(s)

ALFERNESS, CLIFTON A.

Examiner

Scott M. Getzow

Art Unit

3762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/9/06, 9/26/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 28-48 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,375,608.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the present application are an obvious variant over the claims of the parent patent.

3. Claims 28-48 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,893,392 in view of Lekholm (5042463). Lekholm teaches using a radiopaque marker in a patch electrode for placement on the patient's heart. As mentioned in col. 2:47 of Lekholm, such a marker allows for visual inspection of the patch when the chest is closed. Re applicant's claim 1, the phrase 'for evaluating cardiac performance' is considered to be

Art Unit: 3762

intended use only. The marker of Lekholm could be so used if desired. Re applicant's claim 44, to determine the position of the marker is considered to be obvious since the physician would want to know if the device has slipped from the proper position on the heart.

4. Claims 28-48 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,544,168 in view of Lekholm (5042463). It would have been obvious to use the marker of Lekholm for reasons mentioned supra.

5. Claims 28-48 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,165,122 in view of Lekholm (5042463). It would have been obvious to use the marker of Lekholm for reasons mentioned supra

6. Claims 28-48 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,077,218 in view of Lekholm (5042463). It would have been obvious to use the marker of Lekholm for reasons mentioned supra

7. Claims 28-48 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 5,702,343 in view of Lekholm (5042463). It would have been obvious to use the marker of Lekholm for reasons mentioned supra.

8. Claims 44-48 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-49 of

Art Unit: 3762

copending Application No. 10/672,227 in view of Lekholm (5042463). It would have been obvious to use the marker of Lekholm for reasons mentioned supra

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

9. Claims 28-48 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 28-34 of copending Application No. 10/810,099 in view of Lekholm (5042463). It would have been obvious to use the marker of Lekholm for reasons mentioned supra. To use a radiopaque marker, as shown by Lekholm, instead of using a jacket made of radiopaque material, is considered to be an obvious design choice in that the same result is obtained, that of having the ability to monitor the device for slippage on the patient's heart.


This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott M. Getzow whose telephone number is (571) 272-4946. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on (571) 272-4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3762

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Scott M. Getzow
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3762

SMG